

FINLAND REFUSES  
TO AID YUDENITCHRepins She Is Unable to Co-  
operate With Him to  
Win Petrograd.

## IS AFRAID TO OFFEND

Riksdag Gives Finnish Gov-  
ernment a Vote of Con-  
fidence, 70 to 44.

By the Associated Press.  
HELSINKI, Finland, Nov. 4.—The Finnish Government informed Gen. Yudenitch today that it was unable to cooperate with him for the deliverance of Petrograd.

This is the Finnish reply to the appeal of the Northwestern Russian Government for assistance coupled with a recognition of the independence of Finland.

The reply to Yudenitch's appeal sets forth that it is impossible to accede to Finland's internal political situation, her weak finances, the uncertainty of obtaining war materials and the fact that the Senate has not guaranteed that future Russian Governments would recognize Finland's terms of demanding independence for her intervention.

The Finnish Riksdag, after a heated debate gave the Government a vote of confidence of 70 to 44. The Premier in debate said that Finland would continue to be a bulwark against Bolshevism, but that the Government will avoid every interference in Russian affairs tending to offend the national feelings of Russia.

Mr. Gulevitch, the representative of the Northwestern Government at Helsinki, has through the Finnish Government called upon all Russians living in Finland to join Gen. Yudenitch. The Finnish Government recently announced its willingness to permit the recruiting of Russians now in Finland for Gen. Yudenitch's army and even to encourage such enlistments.

JAPAN COOPERATES  
WITH U. S. IN SIBERIATokio Promises Officials Will  
Aid American Civil and  
Army Forces.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 4.—Japan, replying to a note from the American Government last September regarding conditions in Siberia, has expressed a willingness to cooperate with the American authorities, both military and civil, in that country. This announcement was made today at the State Department, but the text of the Japanese reply was withheld. What plans were suggested either by the American or Japanese Government were not disclosed, nor was there any announcement as to whether the negotiations had been concluded.

The note sent by the United States to Tokyo in September has never been made public by the State Department, but dispatches from Tokyo a month ago said the United States had pointed out that should this could be decided upon the American Government might feel compelled to make public the reasons for the withdrawal.

YUDENITCH FORCES  
IN TRAP. REDS CLAIMWhite General Admits Catch-  
ing Taken by Bolsheviks.

HELSINKI, Nov. 3.—A communication issued by Gen. Yudenitch and received here this evening confirms the loss of Gatchina to the Bolsheviks.

General Yudenitch says his army has been compelled to withdraw its front and take new positions westward of Gatchina. He adds that after the Bolsheviks occupied Luga and Pskov and the capture of Luga and Pskov and a comparative short advance to the southern end of Lake Peipus would prove an absolute bar to the retirement southward by Gen. Yudenitch.

Nothing, however, has been received to indicate that the gap between Lake Peipus and the Gulf of Finland has been closed or even that operations threaten-

ing Gen. Yudenitch's communications in this region were in progress. Should this be accurate the troops of Gen. Yudenitch fighting along the Luga-Pskov Railway south of Gatchina, new in Bolshevik hands, would have a most difficult line of retreat across swampy country, broken up by rivers and lakes and with a few good roads, to reach a new line of communications with Riga at Narva or Yamburg, in which vicinity staff headquarters of Gen. Yudenitch are, it is understood, located.

DENIKINE SIGNS  
UKRAINIAN TRUCERevolt Against General Is  
Spreading to Caucasus.

LONDON, Nov. 4.—Gen. Denikine, commander of the Russian southern army, has concluded an armistice with the Ukrainians, according to a Vienna despatch to the Exchange Telegraph Company. The terms of the armistice provide that Denikine shall evacuate Ukraine.

A Bolshevik wireless despatch claims that the revolt against Gen. Denikine spreading to the Caucasus, and that the rebels have occupied Gorany, Berent, Ekaterinburg and Novorossiysk and are besieging Petrovsk.

The Soviet Government, says a Moscow despatch, has issued a manifesto addressed to the "Workers of the World" calling for strikes of protest against attacks on Russia.

EX-EMPEROR'S SON  
MAY RULE HUNGARYRoyalists and Republicans  
Overcome Critics.

By the Associated Press.  
BERLIN, Nov. 4.—A special dispatch to the *Vossische Zeitung* from Budapest reports the crisis in regard to the formation of a government has been overcome by a compromise between royalists and republicans, which will eventually bring the son of former Emperor Carl to the throne of Hungary. Carl will be asked to make a new and formal declaration, renouncing his rights to the Iron Crown of Hungary.

The oldest son of the former Emperor Carl of Austria, the former Prince Imperial of the Dual Monarchy, is Franz Joseph Otto. He was born November 30, 1912. His mother is the former Empress Zita, formerly Princess of Bourbon and Parma, who married his father in 1911, when she was only 19, and who has given four other children to him.

IRELAND MAY HAVE  
TWO PARLIAMENTSScheme Suggested by Cabinet  
Includes Supreme Council.

LONDON, Nov. 5.—The Cabinet Committee on Ireland yesterday accepted the proposal of its subcommittee providing for the creation of two separate Irish Parliaments—one in the Protestant counties of Ulster and the other for the remainder of Ireland—with some form of supreme authority representative to both to embody the idea of a united Ireland, says the *Daily Mail* today.

"The function of the supreme council has not yet been decided," the newspaper adds, "but it is proposed that it shall be elected and that the two Parliaments shall have general direction of all Irish affairs."

The committee also recommends the immediate introduction of a bill further suspending the operation of the home rule act, but it realizes that Parliament will not agree to this unless it is accompanied by a definite proposal from the Government.

Press dispatches from Omak, dated October 24, which were received in the United States today, said that Col. George H. Emerson, of the American Railway Commission, had ordered the withdrawal of the American Railway Corps from Siberia to coincide with the evacuation of the Czech-Slovakia forces for repatriation to Czechoslovakia November 4. State Department officials said, however, that these forces were not to be withdrawn and that the American Railway Commission would continue its operations in Siberia.

YUDENITCH FORCES  
IN TRAP. REDS CLAIMWhite General Admits Catch-  
ing Taken by Bolsheviks.

HELSINKI, Nov. 3.—A communication issued by Gen. Yudenitch and received here this evening confirms the loss of Gatchina to the Bolsheviks.

General Yudenitch says his army has been compelled to withdraw its front and take new positions westward of Gatchina. He adds that after the Bolsheviks occupied Luga and Pskov and the capture of Luga and Pskov and a comparative short advance to the southern end of Lake Peipus would prove an absolute bar to the retirement southward by Gen. Yudenitch.

Nothing, however, has been received to indicate that the gap between Lake Peipus and the Gulf of Finland has been closed or even that operations threaten-

PHILLIPS DENIES U. S.  
IS BLOCKADING REDSGovernment, However, Will  
Not Permit Exports to  
Go to Russia.

## PROPAGANDA IS CITED

Bolshevik Gold Must Not Be  
Permitted to Enter Amer-  
ica, He Says.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 4.—Assistant Secretary of State Phillips said today in a letter to Senator Wadsworth (N. Y.) that no blockade existed against Russia so far as the United States was concerned, but that it is the policy of this Government to refuse export licenses for shipments to Russian territory under Bolshevik control and to refuse to clear vessels to Petrograd, the only remaining Bolshevik port.

Mr. Phillips' letter was in answer to an inquiry for information by the Senator. The Assistant Secretary explained that the measures taken cannot continue after the ratification of peace unless there is new legislation.

The policy of non-intercourse with the Bolsheviks, Mr. Phillips said, is based on two considerations, one of them being that it is the declared purpose of the Government to carry revolution throughout the world. They have available themselves, the Secretary said, every opportunity to initiate in the United States a propaganda aimed to bring about the forcible overthrow of our present form of Government.

The Bolsheviks have a large amount of gold, some of it being what is left of the former Russian gold reserve, and the rest Rumanian gold which had been stored in Moscow for safe keeping by the Rumanians at the time of the German advance. It is important that this gold be not allowed to get into the United States through commercial transactions.

The other consideration is that the Bolsheviks have nationalized all foreign trade and have maintained a system of discrimination in the distribution of food with a view to wipe out the middle classes and to give the Red army three times as much food as the civil population. Consequently American food was withheld.

Enough food to relieve Petrograd for a month, now at Viborg, Finland, to be released when the city is in responsible hands, the Secretary explained, and shipments of flour are being provided for the people of northern Russia as well as to increase the stocks at Viborg.

\$824,000,000 FOR  
WARSHIPS IN JAPANHuge Sea Fighters Included  
in Eight Year Programme.

HONOLULU, Nov. 4.—An eight-year naval programme costing \$824,000,000, has been decided upon by the Japanese Government. It was announced here today in a cable message to the *Shimpou*, a Japanese daily newspaper.

The programme includes the construction of 40,000 ton battleships of the Nagato class, four battle cruisers, twenty light cruisers, eighty destroyers, seventy submarines and thirty other craft.

The Nagato, which will be launched this week, is the second largest warship so far constructed. The Hood of the British Navy displaces 41,000 tons. The Nagato will have 15-inch guns with a range of forty miles, while the Hood carries eight 15-inch guns.

That being true, Senator Borah insisted, if the council at Geneva should recommend that 500,000 men be sent to the Far East to preserve the peace, and if it should ask the United States to send 100,000 of them, the President would have all power to do so.

"Not only that," Senator Borah proceeded, "but there would be upon this

NEW TREATY DEFECT  
SHOWN BY BORAHAmerica Would Be Forced to  
Send Troops Abroad Under  
Article X.

## RESERVATION FUTILE

Lodge's Motion to Strike Out  
Shantung Sections De-  
feated, 26 to 41.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 4.—The last of the proposed amendments to the peace treaty are expected to be disposed of tomorrow when the consideration of the reservations will be taken up.

During the lifeless proceedings today a motion by Senator Lodge (Mass.) to strike out of the treaty the sections dealing with Shantung was defeated, 26 to 41.

No progress was made toward a unanimous consent agreement to rule the final disposal of the treaty, but Senator Hitchcock (Neb.), the Democratic leader, announced that to-morrow he would urge upon the Congress the same arguments that are now presented to induce the Senate to ratify the peace. And Senators would in that case yield as they are yielding in this one.

Senator Cummins (Iowa) interrupted to say that he had intended to vote for the treaty, with reservations. But he was much impressed by the argument of Senator Borah and said that if convinced that Senator Borah was correct in his analysis he never could vote to ratify the treaty with Article X in it.

This brought further development of the argument by Senator Borah. Senator Lenroot (Wis.) took the other view and insisted that no dangerous power was conferred on the President under Article X as modified by the committee reservation.

The discussion brought Article X to the center of the stage again. That prominence was decidedly accentuated by a little contribution that Senator McCormick (Ill.) made to the crossfire of debate. When Senator Borah was arguing that the whole league scheme contemplated this kind of contribution of military and naval power to accomplish its ends, Senator McCormick observed that the cables from Paris already were proving that this view was entertained by the French and British authorities. He even now drawing up detailed plans under which American participation in joint military and naval enterprises may be made prompt and effective.

A similar situation existed at Versailles, Senator Borah pointed out. The President did not want to acquiesce in the British view of freedom of the seas or in the Shantung settlement or in many other features of the treaty, but because it was pressed upon him as necessary in the interest of reestablishing peace, he did at last acquiesce. Having acquiesced he demands that the treaty be ratified without any change whatever.

"It would be exactly the same whether the demand for our acquiescence came from five men at Versailles, or from nine at Geneva," continued the Senator. "It would come in the name of keeping the peace; it would have the backing of international sentiment. It would be urged upon the Congress with the same arguments that are now presented to induce the Senate to ratify the peace. And Senators would in that case yield as they are yielding in this one."

Senator Cummins (Iowa) interrupted to say that he had intended to vote for the treaty, with reservations. But he was much impressed by the argument of Senator Borah and said that if convinced that Senator Borah was correct in his analysis he never could vote to ratify the treaty with Article X in it.

This brought further development of the argument by Senator Borah. Senator Lenroot (Wis.) took the other view and insisted that no dangerous power was conferred on the President under Article X as modified by the committee reservation.

The discussion brought Article X to the center of the stage again. That prominence was decidedly accentuated by a little contribution that Senator McCormick (Ill.) made to the crossfire of debate. When Senator Borah was arguing that the whole league scheme contemplated this kind of contribution of military and naval power to accomplish its ends, Senator McCormick observed that the cables from Paris already were proving that this view was entertained by the French and British authorities. He even now drawing up detailed plans under which American participation in joint military and naval enterprises may be made prompt and effective.

A similar situation existed at Versailles, Senator Borah pointed out. The President did not want to acquiesce in the British view of freedom of the seas or in the Shantung settlement or in many other features of the treaty, but because it was pressed upon him as necessary in the interest of reestablishing peace, he did at last acquiesce. Having acquiesced he demands that the treaty be ratified without any change whatever.

"It would be exactly the same whether the demand for our acquiescence came from five men at Versailles, or from nine at Geneva," continued the Senator. "It would come in the name of keeping the peace; it would have the backing of international sentiment. It would be urged upon the Congress with the same arguments that are now presented to induce the Senate to ratify the peace. And Senators would in that case yield as they are yielding in this one."

Senator Cummins (Iowa) interrupted to say that he had intended to vote for the treaty, with reservations. But he was much impressed by the argument of Senator Borah and said that if convinced that Senator Borah was correct in his analysis he never could vote to ratify the treaty with Article X in it.

This brought further development of the argument by Senator Borah. Senator Lenroot (Wis.) took the other view and insisted that no dangerous power was conferred on the President under Article X as modified by the committee reservation.

The discussion brought Article X to the center of the stage again. That prominence was decidedly accentuated by a little contribution that Senator McCormick (Ill.) made to the crossfire of debate. When Senator Borah was arguing that the whole league scheme contemplated this kind of contribution of military and naval power to accomplish its ends, Senator McCormick observed that the cables from Paris already were proving that this view was entertained by the French and British authorities. He even now drawing up detailed plans under which American participation in joint military and naval enterprises may be made prompt and effective.

A similar situation existed at Versailles, Senator Borah pointed out. The President did not want to acquiesce in the British view of freedom of the seas or in the Shantung settlement or in many other features of the treaty, but because it was pressed upon him as necessary in the interest of reestablishing peace, he did at last acquiesce. Having acquiesced he demands that the treaty be ratified without any change whatever.

"It would be exactly the same whether the demand for our acquiescence came from five men at Versailles, or from nine at Geneva," continued the Senator. "It would come in the name of keeping the peace; it would have the backing of international sentiment. It would be urged upon the Congress with the same arguments that are now presented to induce the Senate to ratify the peace. And Senators would in that case yield as they are yielding in this one."

Senator Cummins (Iowa) interrupted to say that he had intended to vote for the treaty, with reservations. But he was much impressed by the argument of Senator Borah and said that if convinced that Senator Borah was correct in his analysis he never could vote to ratify the treaty with Article X in it.

This brought further development of the argument by Senator Borah. Senator Lenroot (Wis.) took the other view and insisted that no dangerous power was conferred on the President under Article X as modified by the committee reservation.

The discussion brought Article X to the center of the stage again. That prominence was decidedly accentuated by a little contribution that Senator McCormick (Ill.) made to the crossfire of debate. When Senator Borah was arguing that the whole league scheme contemplated this kind of contribution of military and naval power to accomplish its ends, Senator McCormick observed that the cables from Paris already were proving that this view was entertained by the French and British authorities. He even now drawing up detailed plans under which American participation in joint military and naval enterprises may be made prompt and effective.

A similar situation existed at Versailles, Senator Borah pointed out. The President did not want to acquiesce in the British view of freedom of the seas or in the Shantung settlement or in many other features of the treaty, but because it was pressed upon him as necessary in the interest of reestablishing peace, he did at last acquiesce. Having acquiesced he demands that the treaty be ratified without any change whatever.

"It would be exactly the same whether the demand for our acquiescence came from five men at Versailles, or from nine at Geneva," continued the Senator. "It would come in the name of keeping the peace; it would have the backing of international sentiment. It would be urged upon the Congress with the same arguments that are now presented to induce the Senate to ratify the peace. And Senators would in that case yield as they are yielding in this one."

Senator Cummins (Iowa) interrupted to say that he had intended to vote for the treaty, with reservations. But he was much impressed by the argument of Senator Borah and said that if convinced that Senator Borah was correct in his analysis he never could vote to ratify the treaty with Article X in it.

This brought further development of the argument by Senator Borah. Senator Lenroot (Wis.) took the other view and insisted that no dangerous power was conferred on the President under Article X as modified by the committee reservation.

country a strong moral obligation to do it. We would have participated, through our representative, in the arrangement of the programme at Geneva. The league covenant binds us to participate in measures to preserve the world's peace, and this would be such a measure. The President might not want to acquiesce in sending the forces, but our obligations and the public opinion of the world would make it most difficult for him to refuse."

Pressure on President.  
A similar situation existed at Versailles, Senator Borah pointed out. The President did not want to acquiesce in the British view of freedom of the seas or in the Shantung settlement or in many other features of the treaty, but because it was pressed upon him as necessary in the interest of reestablishing peace, he did at last acquiesce. Having acquiesced he demands that the treaty be ratified without any change whatever.

"It would be exactly the same whether the demand for our acquiescence came from five men at Versailles, or from nine at Geneva," continued the Senator. "It would come in the name of keeping the peace; it would have the backing of international sentiment. It would be urged upon the Congress with the same arguments that are now presented to induce the Senate to ratify the peace. And Senators would in that case yield as they are yielding in this one."

Senator Cummins (Iowa) interrupted to say that he had intended to vote for the treaty, with reservations. But he was much impressed by the argument of Senator Borah and said that if convinced that Senator Borah was correct in his analysis he never could vote to ratify the treaty with Article X in it.

This brought further development of the argument by Senator Borah. Senator Lenroot (Wis.) took the other view and insisted that no dangerous power was conferred on the President under Article X as modified by the committee reservation.

The discussion brought Article X to the center of the stage again. That prominence was decidedly accentuated by a little contribution that Senator McCormick (Ill.) made to the crossfire of debate. When Senator Borah was arguing that the whole league scheme contemplated this kind of contribution of military and naval power to accomplish its ends, Senator McCormick observed that the cables from Paris already were proving that this view was entertained by the French and British authorities. He even now drawing up detailed plans under which American participation in joint military and naval enterprises may be made prompt and effective.

A similar situation existed at Versailles, Senator Borah pointed out. The President did not want to acquiesce in the British view of freedom of the seas or in the Shantung settlement or in many other features of the treaty, but because it was pressed upon him as necessary in the interest of reestablishing peace, he did at last acquiesce. Having acquiesced he demands that the treaty be ratified without any change whatever.

"It would be exactly the same whether the demand for our acquiescence came from five men at Versailles, or from nine at Geneva," continued the Senator. "It would come in the name of keeping the peace; it would have the backing of international sentiment. It would be urged upon the Congress with the same arguments that are now presented to induce the Senate to ratify the peace. And Senators would in that case yield as they are yielding in this one."

Senator Cummins (Iowa) interrupted to say that he had intended to vote for the treaty, with reservations. But he was much impressed by the argument of Senator Borah and said that if convinced that Senator Borah was correct in his analysis he never could vote to ratify the treaty with Article X in it.

This brought further development of the argument by Senator Borah. Senator Lenroot (Wis.) took the other view and insisted that no dangerous power was conferred on the President under Article X as modified by the committee reservation.

The discussion brought Article X to the center of the stage again. That prominence was decidedly accentuated by a little contribution that Senator McCormick (Ill.) made to the crossfire of debate. When Senator Borah was arguing that the whole league scheme contemplated this kind of contribution of military and naval power to accomplish its ends, Senator McCormick observed that the cables from Paris already were proving that this view was entertained by the French and British authorities. He even now drawing up detailed plans under which American participation in joint military and naval enterprises may be made prompt and effective.

A similar situation existed at Versailles, Senator Borah pointed out. The President did not want to acquiesce in the British view of freedom of the seas or in the Shantung settlement or in many other features of the treaty, but because it was pressed upon him as necessary in the interest of reestablishing peace, he did at last acquiesce. Having acquiesced he demands that the treaty be ratified without any change whatever.

"It would be exactly the same whether the demand for our acquiescence came from five men at Versailles, or from nine at Geneva," continued the Senator. "It would come in the name of keeping the peace; it would have the backing of international sentiment. It would be urged upon the Congress with the same arguments that are now presented to induce the Senate to ratify the peace. And Senators would in that case yield as they are yielding in this one."

Senator Cummins (Iowa) interrupted to say that he had intended to vote for the treaty, with reservations. But he was much impressed by the argument of Senator Borah and said that if convinced that Senator Borah was correct in his analysis he never could vote to ratify the treaty with Article X in it.

This brought further development of the argument by Senator Borah. Senator Lenroot (Wis.) took the other view and insisted that no dangerous power was conferred on the President under Article X as modified by the committee reservation.

The discussion brought Article X to the center of the stage again. That prominence was decidedly accentuated by a little contribution that Senator McCormick (Ill.) made to the crossfire of debate. When Senator Borah was arguing that the whole league scheme contemplated this kind of contribution of military and naval power to accomplish its ends, Senator McCormick observed that the cables from Paris already were proving that this view was entertained by the French and British authorities. He even now drawing up detailed plans under which American participation in joint military and naval enterprises may be made prompt and effective.

A similar situation existed at Versailles, Senator Borah pointed out. The President did not want to acquiesce in the British view of freedom of the seas or in the Shantung settlement or in many other features of the treaty, but because it was pressed upon him as necessary in the interest of reestablishing peace, he did at last acquiesce. Having acquiesced he demands that the treaty be ratified without any change whatever.

"It would be exactly the same whether the demand for our acquiescence came from five men at Versailles, or from nine at Geneva," continued the Senator. "It would come in the name of keeping the peace; it would have the backing of international sentiment. It would be urged upon the Congress with the same arguments that are now presented to induce the Senate to ratify the peace. And Senators would in that case yield as they are yielding in this one."

Senator Cummins (Iowa) interrupted to say that he had intended to vote for the treaty, with reservations. But he was much impressed by the argument of Senator Borah and said that if convinced that Senator Borah was correct in his analysis he never could vote to ratify the treaty with Article X in it.

This brought further development of the argument by Senator Borah. Senator Lenroot (Wis.) took the other view and insisted that no dangerous power was conferred on the President under Article X as modified by the committee reservation.

The discussion brought Article X to the center of the stage again. That prominence was decidedly accentuated by a little contribution that Senator McCormick (Ill.) made to the crossfire of debate. When Senator Borah was arguing that the whole league scheme contemplated this kind of contribution of military and naval power to accomplish its ends, Senator McCormick observed that the cables from Paris already were proving that this view was entertained by the French and British authorities. He even now drawing up detailed plans under which American participation in joint military and naval enterprises may be made prompt and effective.

A similar situation existed at Versailles, Senator Borah pointed out. The President did not want to acquiesce in the British view of freedom of the seas or in the Shantung settlement or in many other features of the treaty, but because it was pressed upon him as necessary in the interest of reestablishing peace, he did at last acquiesce. Having acquiesced he demands that the treaty be ratified without any change whatever.

"It would be exactly the same whether the demand for our acquiescence came from five men at Versailles, or from nine at Geneva," continued the Senator. "It would come in the name of keeping the peace; it would have the backing of international sentiment. It would be urged upon the Congress with the same arguments that are now presented to induce the Senate to ratify the peace. And Senators would in that case yield as they are yielding in this one."

Senator Cummins (Iowa) interrupted to say that he had intended to vote for the treaty, with reservations. But he was much impressed by the argument of Senator Borah and said that if convinced that Senator Borah was correct in his analysis he never could vote to ratify the treaty with Article X in it.

This brought further development of the argument by Senator Borah. Senator Lenroot (Wis.) took the other view and insisted that no dangerous power was conferred on the President under Article X as modified by the committee reservation.

The discussion brought Article X to the center of the stage again. That prominence was decidedly accentuated by a little contribution that Senator McCormick (Ill.) made to the crossfire of debate. When Senator Borah was arguing that the whole league scheme contemplated this kind of contribution of military and naval power to accomplish its ends, Senator McCormick observed that the cables from Paris already were proving that this view was entertained by the French and British authorities. He even now drawing up detailed plans under which American participation in joint military and naval enterprises may be made prompt and effective.

A similar situation existed at Versailles, Senator Borah pointed out. The President did not want to acquiesce in the British view of freedom of the seas or in the Shantung settlement or in many other features of the treaty, but because it was pressed upon him as necessary in the interest of reestablishing peace, he did at last acquiesce. Having acquiesced he demands that the treaty be ratified without any change whatever.

"It would be exactly the same whether the demand for our acquiescence came from five men at Versailles, or from nine at Geneva," continued the Senator. "It would come in the name of keeping the peace; it would have the backing of international sentiment. It would be urged upon the Congress with the same arguments that are now presented to induce the Senate to ratify the peace. And Senators would in that case yield as they are yielding in this one."

Senator Cummins (Iowa) interrupted to say that he had intended to vote for the treaty, with reservations. But he was much impressed by the argument of Senator Borah and said that if convinced that Senator Borah was correct in his analysis he never could vote to ratify the treaty with Article X in it.

This brought further development of the argument by Senator Borah. Senator Lenroot (Wis.) took the other view and insisted that no dangerous power was conferred on the President under Article X as modified by the committee reservation.

The discussion brought Article X to the center of the stage again. That prominence was decidedly accentuated by a little contribution that Senator McCormick (Ill.) made to the crossfire of debate. When Senator Borah was arguing that the whole league scheme contemplated this kind of contribution of military and naval power to accomplish its ends, Senator McCormick observed that the cables from Paris already were proving that this view was entertained by the French and British authorities. He even now drawing up detailed plans under which American participation in joint military and naval enterprises may be made prompt and effective.

A similar situation existed at Versailles, Senator Borah pointed out. The President did not want to acquiesce in the British view of freedom of the seas or in the Shantung settlement or in many other features of the treaty, but because it was pressed upon him as necessary in the interest of reestablishing peace, he did at last acquiesce. Having acquiesced he demands that the treaty be ratified without any change whatever.

to say that he had intended to vote for the treaty, with reservations. But he was much impressed by the argument of Senator Borah and said that if convinced that Senator Borah was correct in his analysis he never could vote to ratify the treaty with Article X in it.

This brought further development of the argument by Senator Borah. Senator Lenroot (Wis.) took the other view and insisted that no dangerous power was conferred on the President under Article X as modified by the committee reservation.

The discussion brought Article X to the center of the stage again. That prominence was decidedly accentuated by a little contribution that Senator McCormick (Ill.) made to the crossfire of debate. When Senator Borah was arguing that the whole league scheme contemplated this kind of contribution of military and naval power to accomplish its ends, Senator McCormick observed that the cables from Paris already were proving that this view was entertained by the French and British authorities. He even now drawing up detailed plans under which American participation in joint military and naval enterprises may be made prompt and effective.

A similar situation existed at Versailles, Senator Borah pointed out. The President did not want to acquiesce in the British view of freedom of the seas or in the Shantung settlement or in many other features of the treaty, but because it was pressed upon him as necessary in the interest of reestablishing peace, he did at last acquiesce. Having acquiesced he demands that the treaty be ratified without any change whatever.

"It would be exactly the same whether the demand for our acquiescence came from five men at Versailles, or from nine at Geneva," continued the Senator. "It would come in the name of keeping the peace; it would have the backing of international sentiment. It would be urged upon the Congress with the same arguments that are now presented to induce the Senate to ratify the peace. And Senators would in that case yield as they are yielding in this one."

Senator Cummins (Iowa) interrupted to say that he had intended to vote for the treaty, with reservations. But he was much impressed by the argument of Senator Borah and said that if convinced that Senator Borah was correct in his analysis he never could vote to ratify the treaty with Article X in it.

This brought further development of the argument by Senator Borah. Senator Lenroot (Wis.) took the other view and insisted that no dangerous power was conferred on the President under Article X as modified by the committee reservation.

The discussion brought Article X to the center of the stage again. That prominence was decidedly accentuated by a little contribution that Senator McCormick (Ill.) made to the crossfire of debate. When Senator Borah was arguing that the whole league scheme contemplated this kind of contribution of military and naval power to accomplish its ends, Senator McCormick observed that the cables from Paris already were proving that this view was entertained by the French and British authorities. He even now drawing up detailed plans under which American participation in joint military and naval enterprises may be made prompt and effective.

A similar situation existed at Versailles, Senator Borah pointed out. The President did not want to acquiesce in the British view of freedom of the seas or in the Shantung settlement or in many other features of the treaty, but because it was pressed upon him as necessary in the interest of reestablishing peace, he did at last acquiesce. Having acquiesced he demands that the treaty be ratified without any change whatever.

"It would be exactly the same whether the demand for our acquiescence came from five men at Versailles, or from nine at Geneva," continued the Senator. "It would come in the name of keeping the peace; it would have the backing of international sentiment. It would be urged upon the Congress with the same arguments that are now presented to induce the Senate to ratify the peace. And Senators would in that case yield as they are yielding in this one."

Senator Cummins (Iowa) interrupted to say that he had intended to vote for the treaty, with reservations. But he was much impressed by the argument of Senator Borah and said that if convinced that Senator Borah was correct in his analysis he never could vote to ratify the treaty with Article X in it.

This brought further development of the argument by Senator Borah. Senator Lenroot (Wis.) took the other view and insisted that no dangerous power was conferred on the President under Article X as modified by the committee reservation.

The discussion brought Article X to the center of the stage again. That prominence was decidedly accentuated by a little contribution that Senator McCormick (Ill.) made to the crossfire of debate. When Senator Borah was arguing that the whole league scheme contemplated this kind of contribution of military and naval power to accomplish its ends, Senator McCormick observed that the cables from Paris already were proving that this view was entertained by the French and British authorities. He even now drawing up detailed plans under which American participation in joint military and naval enterprises may be made prompt and effective.